

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

The Secretary
M.S. 1170

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

3 JUN 1994

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

IN REPLY REFER TO:
CN9402345

RECEIVED

JUN 6 1994

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

The Honorable Charles W. Stenholm
U.S. House of Representatives
1211 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Stenholm:

This is in reply to your letter of May 17, 1994, on behalf of your constituent, R. E. "Archie" Archibald, a board member of the Howard County 911 Communication District, who is interested in the implementation of Enhanced 911 (E-911) technology in the Personal Communication Services industry.

On September 23, 1993, the Commission adopted a Second Report and Order in GEN Docket No. 90-314 that established rules for new Personal Communications Services (PCS). In this Order, we urged the PCS industry and standards-setting bodies to "direct particular attention [to] offering an emergency 911 capability that would work with enhanced-911 systems (E-911) and, to the extent feasible, permit locating a caller in situations where the caller is unable to state his location." Also, we indicated that we were contemplating the initiation of a future rule making proceeding "to address E-911 and related issues with regard to PCS, cellular, and any other relevant mobile service."

In response to our Order, the Texas Attorney General's Office filed a Petition for Reconsideration requesting that we require PCS licensees to provide E-911 service as a condition of license, and that we require development of a single, uniform standard for PCS E-911 service. There were a number of comments filed in support of Texas' petition. Several companies expressed concern about the potentially significant added costs of providing precise E-911 location information, as well as the delays that an FCC mandate for providing such information could bring to PCS development.

We are carefully considering the Texas petition and the comments filed in response to it. Because of the importance of this issue, we are considering the initiation of a separate rule making proceeding later this year dedicated exclusively to the E-911 capabilities of mobile telephone services. Such a proceeding would allow us to fully address all regulatory aspects of E-911, and to develop the most fair and effective regulations possible. In the meantime, a joint industry group consisting of representatives from the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials (APCO), the National Emergency Number Association (NENA), and the Personal Communications Industry Association (PCIA), have been working to develop a common position on how PCS E-911 service should be implemented. We expect the results of those discussions to be filed with the Commission shortly.

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

2 copies

The Honorable Charles W. Stenholm

2.

We appreciate your constituent's thoughts on this important topic and have added them, along with your letter, to the record in the PCS proceeding.

Sincerely,



Thomas P. Stanley
Chief Engineer

Richard B. Engelman
Chief, OET/AED/TSB

Julius P. Knapp
Chief, OET/AED

cc (w/incoming): Secretary, for inclusion in GEN Docket 90-314 ✓

cc: Chief Engineer
Julius Knapp
Richard Engelman
Robert Bromery
Art Wall
DWilson:kls:05-31-94

31030/EQU/4-2-0
1300B4

CHARLES W. STENHOLM

17TH DISTRICT
TEXAS

COMMITTEES:

BUDGET

AGRICULTURE

CHAIRMAN OF SUBCOMMITTEE
ON DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS
AND NUTRITION

DEMOCRATIC DEPUTY WHIP

4033
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

May 17, 1994

Please Respond to:

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
1211 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-6605

DISTRICT OFFICES:
P.O. Box 1237
STAMFORD, TX 79553
(915) 773-3623

P.O. Box 1101
ABILENE, TX 79604
(915) 673-7221

33 E. TWOHIG AVENUE, #318
SAN ANGELO, TX 76903
(915) 655-7994

Chairman Reed Hundt
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 802
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Chairman Hundt:

I have recently received the enclosed correspondence requesting my assistance. I am forwarding the request to you in the hope that you may be able to assist me in responding to my constituent.

If you would review the attached information, and look into this situation, any information, suggestions or advice that you could offer would be greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this matter, please feel free to contact Daniel Hassan in my Washington office at (202) 225-6605.

On behalf of my constituent, I want to thank you for your assistance in this matter. I am looking forward to hearing from you in the near future.

With my best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,



Charles W. Stenholm
Member of Congress

CWS:djh

Sample letter to FCC
PCS/cellular access to E911

Reed Hundt
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: GN Docket 90-314, Personal Communications Service (PCS)

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Commission's Second Report and Order in the referenced proceeding last October adopted regulations for the new mobile radiotelephone service called PCS, and it appears that you may grant the first licenses late this year or early in 1995. But an important piece of lifesaving business remains unfinished: Identifying and locating 911 callers who use mobile phones.

The Commission's October order recognized the problem, at ¶139:

The industry and standards-setting bodies should direct particular attention [to] offering an emergency 911 capability that would work with enhanced 911 systems (E-911) and, to the extent feasible, permit locating a caller in situations where that caller is unable to state his location. We are particularly concerned that unless an E-911 capability is designed into PCS systems, dialing 911 from a PCS telephone will not be equivalent to dialing 911 from a traditional wired telephone. (emphasis added)

The Commission said it could not require E-911 capability for PCS now, but would soon open another proceeding to look at the problem.

The Texas emergency communications agency, supported by 11 other states and by the National Emergency Number Association (NENA) has asked the Commission to reconsider its October decision not to require E-911 for PCS immediately. These states and NENA have asked you to adopt the requirement in the rules, or to make it a condition of PCS license, while leaving the industry and standards-setting bodies to come up with the precise technical methods.

Mr. Chairman, PCS equipment is being designed and readied for manufacture right now. The industry has made clear its answer: Let us introduce PCS without E-911, and we'll try to add the capability later. But many technologies for locating PCS callers are available now, and the Commission has the power to require manufacturers and service providers to settle quickly on the best solution.

Every day in this country, thousands of the hundreds of thousands of 911 calls placed are cries for help where the small children or other victims do not know or cannot give their locations. But more than three out of four wire telephones are equipped to identify and locate those callers automatically anyway. That is not true for cellular telephones, and it won't be true for PCS calling unless and until the FCC requires E-911 from the beginning.

Chairman Hundt, on behalf of the dedicated E911 emergency communications and response workers in my [district] [state], I urge the Commission to reconsider the October order and to require E911 for PCS from the start of service. Please let me know the status and timing of both the reconsideration and separate proceedings in which this lifesaving problem can and must be solved. Every day without a solution is a day when lives are needlessly lost or endangered.

Sincerely,

[Congressman or Senator]

cc: Thomas P. Stanley, Chief Engineer
GN Docket 90-314



A Professional Corporation, Specializing in
all Phases of Petroleum Land Services

11/11/95
4/1/8

April 12, 1994

Representative Stenholm
Room 1212 Longworth Office Bldg
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Representative Stenholm:

It is the greatest sense of urgency that I bring to your attention, a serious problem which could result in one of the worst life safety issues of our time, and ultimately threaten the health and safety of our citizens throughout America.

Today, more than 70% of our nation's populace can immediately access emergency service by dialing 9-1-1. Almost 90% of those systems in place are currently utilizing Enhanced 9-1-1 technology, which enables the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) to immediately identify the caller's telephone number and location, commonly referred to as (ANI) Automatic Number Identification, and (ALI) Automatic Location Identification, from a fixed hard wire location during times of emergencies. Time after time, case after case, Enhanced 9-1-1 system features have assisted our Public Safety Emergency Communications Professionals in the rapid deployment of our nations emergency service responders in a timely and accurate manner, saving lives and property.

The issue at hand relates to our National Telecommunications Industry, which has been actively pursuing the design and development of new wireless services called P. C. S. (Personal Communications Service). PCS's are apparently the wave of the future and will operate similar to cellular phones. The systems will utilize small, wireless inexpensive phones to transmit phone conversation over short distances to numerous transmit sites, and once competitively manufactured, they will be rapidly marketed and deployed throughout America during the next year or two. There are numerous test programs already underway across the country. Unfortunately, dialing Enhanced 9-1-1 from a PCS telephone will not be equivalent to dialing Enhanced 9-1-1 from a traditional wired telephone.

The situation is so serious, that even though representatives of both the National Emergency Number Association (NENA) and the Associated Public Safety Communications Officer's (APCO) took the initiative of personally travelling to Washington, D. C. on September 10, 1993 to meet and present information concerning this imminent life safety issue before key staff members of each of the

Representative Stenholm
April 12, 1994
Page 2

three FCC Commissioner's, as well as before the Chief Engineer of the F.C.C. The general Docket #90-314, released on October 22, 1993 only draws attention to the problem and suggests that the industry should provide Enhanced 9-1-1 capability. The Federal Communications Commission Ruling claims that there is not sufficient record before the Commission to impose an E9-1-1 mandate on PCS operators at this time.

This decision is totally unacceptable, and is just one more example in which the life safety of our citizens throughout America has not been brought to the forefront.

Absent any formal mandate or standard by the Federal Communications Commission requiring the Telecommunications Industry to provide Enhanced 9-1-1 capability from Personal Communications Systems devices prior to their implementations in the future.


"THE VITAL LIFE SAVING TECHNOLOGY OF ENHANCED 9-1-1 SYSTEMS AS WE KNOW THEM TODAY, WOULD BE RENDERED VIRTUALLY OBSOLETE."

Literally millions of dollars invested in life safety by Local, County, State and Federal Government entities, and the related industry would be wasted. The health, safety, and welfare of our citizenry throughout America would become the ultimate sacrifice if we allow such a tragic scenario to occur.

We are currently in a similar situation as cellular phones become cheaper and easier to acquire. Currently there is talk of changing the legislation that governs cellular type service. Even this is met with some resistance.

Enclosed is a form letter to Chairman Reed Hundt. If you can see your way to pass this important information along it would make for a safer America.

Yours truly,



R. E. "Archie" Archibald
Board Member
Howard County 911 Communication District

REA/ar
enc